UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/784,369	02/14/2001	Andruid Kerne	12727-1	2952

7590 05/21/2004

William A. English Esq.
Bingham McCutchen, LLP
Three Embarcadero Center
Suite 1800
San Francisco, CA 94111-4067

EXAMINER	
SAIN, GAUTAM	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	6

DATE MAILED: 05/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/784,369	Applicant(s) KERNE, ANDRUID
	Examiner Gautam Sain	Art Unit 2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 April 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-42* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-42* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3-7/01*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1) 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

1-1 Claims 1- 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-42 set forth non-functional descriptive material but fail to set forth physical structures or materials comprising of hardware or a combination of hardware and software within the technological arts (ie., computer) to produce a "useful, concrete and tangible" result. For example, Claims 1, 17 and 22 reads on a mental construct/abstract idea or at best a computer program, per se. The language "visualizing digital media", etc., does not clearly define structural elements and are not tangibly embodied on a computer readable medium. Additionally, claim 16 reads on a mental construct/abstract idea or at best a computer program per se. The language " computing the size of a new element to placed in a weighted presentation grid", etc., does not clearly define structural elements and are not tangibly embodied on a computer readable medium.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2) The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2-1) Claim 16 recites the limitation "significance weight" in paragraph (b). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3) The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3-1) Claims 1,2,3,4,5,6,8,9,10, 17, 18, 19, 22,23, 24 25, 26, 27, 39, 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Kerne publication, *CollageMachine: Temporality and Indeterminacy in Media Browsing via Interface Ecology* (Marcy 22-27, 1997, as provided in the applicant's IDS, copyrighted 1997 by Andruid Kerne).

For Claim 1, Kerne teaches "a presentation grid ... document" (ie., collage layout based on user preference)(page 1)(ie., image URL downloaded – new Netscape browser window)(page 3).

Kerne teaches "an accessor ... documents" (ie., media pulled from web pages)(page 1 – Abstract section).

Kerne teaches 'a document parser ... document components' (ie., parsing of HTML ... first HTML file ... partially parsed)(page 3).

Kerne teaches 'an agent to store ... said model' (ie., relational database as a source for media; user-responsive performance)(page 2)(ie., user's expression of preferences ... retrieve)(page 1).

For Claim 2, Kerne teaches " ... response to user input" (ie., user clicks)(page 3).

For Claim 3, Kerne teaches " document component ... model" (ie., relational database)(page 2).

For claim 4, Kerne teaches "a weight ... generated by the document parser" (ie., mechanism for expressing interest or disinterest in collage elements... prioritizing)(page 3).

Kerne teaches "alter ... user input" (ie., element may be brought to the top or removed)(page 3).

Kerne teaches "document component ... said model" (ie., user clicks ... displaying media elements on the layout)(page 3).

For claim 5, Kerne teaches "at least one ... in said model" (ie., user interest, disinterest ... prioritizing media elements)(page 3).

For claim 6, Kerne teaches "at least one ... said presentation grid" (ie., elements brought to top or removed from collage)(page 3).

For claim 8, Kerne teaches "... acquire HTML pages" (ie., HTML file)(page 3).

For claim 9, Kerne teaches "... multimedia documents" (ie., media elements are pulled)(page 1).

For claim 10, Kerne teaches "... Internet" (ie., the web)(page 1).

For claim 17, Kerne teaches "providing ... medial elements" (ie., ... media elements)(Abstract section, page 1).

Kerne teaches "assigning ... media element" (ie., user interest, disinterest ... prioritizing media elements)(page 3).

Kerne teaches "establishing a presentation grid" (ie.,CollageMachine has a collage layout; element may be brought to the top or removed)(page 1-3).

Kerne teaches "selecting a media element ... significance weights," "placing ... grid" (ie., user clicks ... displaying media elements on the layout)(pages 1-3).

For claim 18, Kerne teaches "providing the initial value " (ie., user's expression of preferences and interests with design rules and semantic rules to make decisions about the collage layout and about which media to retrieve)(page 3). Specifically, upon the user's input of the parameters, the initial values to the prioritization is set.

Kerne teaches determining if any ... increasing the significance ... response" (ie., mechanism for expressing interest or disinterest in collage elements... prioritizing)(page 3).

For claim 19, Kerne teaches "increasing ... to user input" (ie., mechanism for expressing interest or disinterest in collage elements... prioritizing)(page 3).

For claim 22, Kerne teaches "decomposing ... components" (ie., parsing HTML files into chunks and image URLs)(page 3).

Kerne teaches "assigning ... components" (ie., expressing interest/disinterest ...)(page 3).

Kerne teaches "storing ... document references" (ie., relational database)(page 2).

Kerne teaches "establishing ... grid" (ie., collageMachine layout, temporal composition)(page 2).

Kerne teaches " selecting ... weights (ie., priortization)(page 3).

Kerne teaches " placing ... grid" (ie., collageMachine ... visual assemblage)(page 1-3).

For claim 23, Kerne teaches "assigning ... element " (ie., user interest, disinterest ... prioritizing media elements)(page 3).

For claim 24, Kerne teaches "parsing ... tags" (ie., parsing HTML file, multithreaded Java implementation...)(page 3, top).

For claim 25, "... HTML tags " (ie., HTML ...)(page 3, top).

For claim 26, Kerne teaches "providing ... weight" (ie., mechanism for expressing interest or disinterest in collage elements... prioritizing)(page 3).

Kerne teaches "determining if any of said ... in response " (ie., GUI for user to express interest or disinterest ... brought to top or removed ... prioritizing)(page 3, GUI section).

For claim 27, Kerne teaches "increasing ... user input" (ie., GUI for user to express interest or disinterest ... brought to top or removed ... prioritizing)(page 3, GUI section).

For claim 39, Kerne teaches "selecting a ... operation" (ie., prioritizing the media elements upon the user expressing interest and bringing to top or removing elements from collage)(page 3, middle).

For claim 42, Kerne teaches "selecting ... operation"(ie., prioritizing media elements based on user interest or disinterest)(page 3, GUI section).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4-1) Claims 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 20, 28, 34 , 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kerne (as cited above), in view of Perlin et al (US 5342466, issued Aug 1994, as cited in the applicant's IDS).

For claim 7, Kerne does not expressly teach, but Perlin teaches "... floating point number" (ie., ... floating point number)(col 17, lines 5-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kerne to teach a floating point number as taught by Perlin, providing the benefit of a computer user interface that represents information stored in a computer as representation objects located on at least one reference surface, where images in the sequence is a bit-mapped representation of an object (Perlin, Abstract), and a fractal interface capabilities with internal bit-mapped representations of images to the workstation screen (Perlin, col 8, lines 40-45).

For claim 11, Kerne does not expressly teach, but Perlin teaches "a doubly linked list ... said presentation grid" (ie., doubly linked list)(col 10, lines 50-55; fig 6, item 20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kerne to teach a doubly linked list as taught by Perlin, providing the benefit of a computer user interface that represents information stored in a computer as representation objects located on at least one reference surface, where images in the sequence is a bit-mapped representation of an object (Perlin, Abstract), and a fractal interface capabilities with internal bit-mapped representations of images to the workstation screen (Perlin, col 8, lines 40-45).

For claim 12, Kerne does not expressly teach, but Perlin teaches "an array ... rapid sorting ... presentation grid" (ie., images stored as files in the array ...)(col 11, lines 22-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kerne to teach images stored as files in the array as taught by Perlin, providing the benefit of a computer user interface that represents information stored in a computer as representation objects located on at least one reference surface, where images in the sequence is a bit-mapped representation of an object (Perlin, Abstract), and a fractal interface capabilities with internal bit-mapped representations of images to the workstation screen (Perlin, col 8, lines 40-45).

For claim 13, Kerne does not expressly teach, but Perlin teaches " placement grid ... placement are reduced "(ie., two-dimensional coordinate system defined for each surface)(col 7, lines 45-68).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kerne to teach a two-dimensional coordinate system as taught by Perlin, providing the benefit of a computer user interface that represents information stored in a computer as representation objects located on at least one reference surface, where images in the sequence is a bit-mapped representation of an object (Perlin, Abstract), and a fractal interface capabilities with internal bit-mapped representations of images to the workstation screen (Perlin, col 8, lines 40-45).

For claim 14, Kerne does not teach, but Perlin teaches "two dimensional array of grid cell objects ... object boundary" (ie., two-dimensional coordinate system defined for each surface; bounding rectangle)(col 7, lines 45-68; col 11, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kerne to teach a two-dimensional coordinate system and bounding rectangle on the document component for aligning as taught by Perlin, providing the benefit of a computer user interface that represents information stored in a computer as representation objects located on at least one reference surface, where images in the sequence is a bit-mapped representation of an object (Perlin, Abstract), and a fractal interface capabilities with internal bit-mapped representations of images to the workstation screen (Perlin, col 8, lines 40-45).

For claim 15, Kerne does not expressly teach, but Perlin teaches "a doubly linked list ... each grid cell object" (ie., doubly linked list)(col 10, lines 50-55; fig 6, item 20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kerne to teach a doubly linked list as taught by Perlin, providing the benefit of a computer user interface that represents information stored in a computer as representation objects located on at least one reference surface, where images in the sequence is a bit-mapped representation of an object (Perlin, Abstract), and a fractal interface capabilities with internal bit-mapped representations of images to the workstation screen (Perlin, col 8, lines 40-45).

For claim 20, Kerne does not teach, but Perlin teaches "creating a ... cells," "establishing ... media elements" (ie., doubly linked list)(col 10, lines 50-65; fig 6, item 20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kerne to teach a doubly linked list for media elements as taught by Perlin, providing the benefit of a computer user interface that represents information stored in a computer as representation objects located on at least one reference surface, where images in the sequence is a bit-mapped representation of an object (Perlin, Abstract), and a fractal interface capabilities with internal bit-mapped representations of images to the workstation screen (Perlin, col 8, lines 40-45).

For claim 28, Kerne does not teach, but Perlin teaches "creating a ... cells," "establishing ... media elements" (ie., doubly linked list)(col 10, lines 50-65; fig 6, item 20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kerne to teach a doubly linked list for media elements as taught by Perlin, providing the benefit of a computer user interface that represents information stored in a computer as representation objects located on at least one reference surface, where images in the sequence is a bit-mapped representation of an object (Perlin, Abstract), and a fractal interface capabilities with internal bit-mapped representations of images to the workstation screen (Perlin, col 8, lines 40-45).

For claim 30, Kerne teaches " creating ... grid cell" (ie., visual media elements may overlap ...)(page 2, bottom).

For claim 34, Kerne does not teach, but Perlin teaches "choosing ... element," "identify ... size" (ie., user can magnify or reduce ...)(col 3, lines 45-65).

Kerne teaches "determining a weight ... region," "selecting ... weights" (ie., user clicks ... GUI ... user ... expressing interest or disinterest ...)(page 3, GUI section).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kerne to teach magnifying or reducing display information as taught by Perlin, providing the benefit of a computer user interface that represents information stored in a computer as representation objects located on at least one reference surface, where images in the sequence is a bit-mapped representation of an object

(Perlin, Abstract), and a fractal interface capabilities with internal bit-mapped representations of images to the workstation screen (Perlin, col 8, lines 40-45).

For claim 35, Kerne teaches "... grid region ... size" (ie., prioritizing media elements based on user interest)(page 3).

For claim 36, Kerne does not teach expressly, but Perlin teaches "... assigning an initial size ... element" (ie., when user initially magnifies or reduces the display information)(col 3, lines 50-60; col 6, lines 57-58).

Kerne does not teach expressly, but Perlin teaches "determining an ... pixel ... grid units" (ie., user magnifies or reduces initially)(col 3, lines 50-67; col 6, lines 57-68)

Kerne does not teach expressly, but Perlin teaches "selecting ... pixels" (ie., pixel squares with images)(col 6, lines 60 – col 7, lines 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kerne to teach magnifying or reducing display information and pixel squares in the bit mapped images as taught by Perlin, providing the benefit of a computer user interface that represents information stored in a computer as representation objects located on at least one reference surface, where images in the sequence is a bit-mapped representation of an object (Perlin, Abstract), and a fractal interface capabilities with internal bit-mapped representations of images to the workstation screen (Perlin, col 8, lines 40-45).

For claim 37, Kerne teaches " calculating grid ... presentation grid" (ie., user expresses interest... elements move to top ... prioritized in CollageMachine)(page 3, GUI section).

For claim 38, Kerne teaches "calculating ... grid region" (ie., prioritizing the media elements upon the user expressing interest and bringing to top or removing elements from collage)(page 3, middle).

For claim 40, Kerne does not expressly teach, but Perlin teaches "establishing ... placement grid" (ie., user can magnify or reduce display information after selecting a region to alter...)(col 3, lines 45-68).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kerne to teach magnifying or reducing display region information by the user as taught by Perlin, providing the benefit of a computer user interface that represents information stored in a computer as representation objects located on at least one reference surface, where images in the sequence is a bit-mapped representation of an object (Perlin, Abstract), and a fractal interface capabilities with internal bit-mapped representations of images to the workstation screen (Perlin, col 8, lines 40-45).

For claim 41, Kerne teaches "calculating ... from grid cells" (ie., user expressing interest ... prioritizing)(page 3, middle).

Kerne does not teach expressly, but Perlin teaches " associated screen ... region" (ie., user selects an area to magnify)(col 3, lines 45-68).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kerne to teach magnifying or reducing display region information by the user as taught by Perlin, providing the benefit of a computer user interface that represents information stored in a computer as representation objects located on at

least one reference surface, where images in the sequence is a bit-mapped representation of an object (Perlin, Abstract), and a fractal interface capabilities with internal bit-mapped representations of images to the workstation screen (Perlin, col 8, lines 40-45).

4-2) Claim 21, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kerne (as cited above), in view of Pirolli et al, (US 5835905, issued Nov 1998, as cited in the applicant's IDS), further in view of Perlin et al (US 5342466, issued Aug 1994, as cited in the applicant's IDS).

For claim 21, 29, Kerne teaches "assigning a screen weight to ... elements" (ie., prioritizing elements)(page 3).

Kerne does not teach, but Pirolli does teaches "preselecting ... grid" (ie., prediction of need or relevance ...)(col 2, lines 1-37).

Kerne in view of Pirolli does not teach, but Perlin teaches "removing ... screen weight" (ie., displays of choices are removed)(col 1, lines 45-57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kerne to teach prediction of need or relevance as taught by Pirolli, providing the benefit a large linked collection of documents to improve the rate at which they gain information and avoiding sluggishness to assess the global nature of the collection or aid in decisions about what documents to pursue (Pirolli, col 1, lines 22-67), and further to teach removing display choices as taught by Perlin, providing the benefit of a computer user interface that represents information stored in a computer as representation objects located on at least one reference surface, where images in the

sequence is a bit-mapped representation of an object (Perlin, Abstract), and a fractal interface capabilities with internal bit-mapped representations of images to the workstation screen (Perlin, col 8, lines 40-45).

4-3) Claim 31, 32, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kerne (as cited above), in view of Perlin et al (US 5342466, issued Aug 1994, as cited in the applicant's IDS), further in view of Pirolli et al, (US 5835905, issued Nov 1998, as cited in the applicant's IDS),.

For claim 31, Kerne does not expressly teach, but Perlin teaches "a doubly linked list ... said presentation grid" (ie., doubly linked list)(col 10, lines 50-55; fig 6, item 20).

Kerne teaches "sorting ... screen weight" (ie., element may be brought to top or removed... prioritizing)(page 3).

Kerne does not teach, but Pirolli does not teach "preselecting ... grid" (ie., prediction of need or relevance ...)(col 2, lines 1-37).

Kerne in view of Pirolli does not teach, but Perlin teaches "removing ... screen weight" (ie., displays of choices are removed)(col 1, lines 45-57).

Kerne teaches "rebuilding ... screen weight order" (ie., element may be brought to top or removed... prioritizing)(page 3).

Kerne teaches "updating ... elements having lower screen weight ... user" (ie., element may be brought to top or removed... prioritizing)(page 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kerne to teach a doubly linked list as taught by Perlin, providing the

benefit of a computer user interface that represents information stored in a computer as representation objects located on at least one reference surface, where images in the sequence is a bit-mapped representation of an object (Perlin, Abstract), and a fractal interface capabilities with internal bit-mapped representations of images to the workstation screen (Perlin, col 8, lines 40-45), further to teach prediction of need or relevance as taught by Pirolli, providing the benefit a large linked collection of documents to improve the rate at which they gain information and avoiding sluggishness to assess the global nature of the collection or aid in decisions about what documents to pursue (Pirolli, col 1, lines 22-67).

For claim 32, Kerne does not teach, but Perlin teaches "avoiding ... grid," (ie., traversing the object of the linked list ...)(col 15, lines 57 – col 16, line 15; figure 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kerne to teach traversing a doubly linked list for media elements as taught by Perlin, providing the benefit of a computer user interface that represents information stored in a computer as representation objects located on at least one reference surface, where images in the sequence is a bit-mapped representation of an object (Perlin, Abstract), and a fractal interface capabilities with internal bit-mapped representations of images to the workstation screen (Perlin, col 8, lines 40-45).

For claim 33, Kerne does not teach, but Perlin teaches "establishing a cell ... in the grid cell" (ie., doubly linked list for data objects of the interface ...)(col 10, lines 50-68).

Kerne does not teach, but Perlin teaches "avoiding ... grid," (ie., traversing the object of the linked list ...)(col 15, lines 57 – col 16, line 15; figure 10).

Kerne does not teach, but Perlin teaches "updating ... linked list" (ie., DISPLAY function for copying ... parent image)(col 22, lines 41-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kerne to teach traversing the objects of a doubly linked list for media elements as taught by Perlin, providing the benefit of a computer user interface that represents information stored in a computer as representation objects located on at least one reference surface, where images in the sequence is a bit-mapped representation of an object (Perlin, Abstract), and a fractal interface capabilities with internal bit-mapped representations of images to the workstation screen (Perlin, col 8, lines 40-45).

Other Cases

5) A. Higashio et al (US 5945982, issued Aug 1999).

B. Wittenberg et al (US 6515656, filed Apr 1999).

C. Tarabella (US 5796945, issued Aug 1998).

D. Renolds et al (US 5513991, issued May 1996).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 703-305-8777. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on (703)305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

GS

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER